REMARKS

This paper is being provided in response to the June 9, 2003 Final Office Action for the above-referenced application. In this response, Applicant has added new Claims 94-100 and amended Claims 1, 17-19, 25-27, 50, 67, 87, 92, and 93 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant deems to be the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the modifications to the Claims and the newly added claims are supported by the originally-filed application.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15-19 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stiegemeier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,381, hereinafter referred to as "Stiegemeier") in view of Hoth (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,583) is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15-19 and 25-27, as amended herein, are patentable over the references.

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, recites a computer implemented method. Data is received that represents a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented. The format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data. The visual form of data is analyzed using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data. The content data and the format data are different from the template. The identified content data is stored. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 15 and 16 depend from Claim 1.

Applicant's Claim 17, as amended herein, recites computer readable media containing a computer program including instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; analyzing the visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format are different from the template; and storing the identified content data.

Applicant's Claim 18, as amended herein, recites a computer system including: a input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; a processor that analyzes the visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and a storage media that stores the identified content data.

Applicant's Claim 19, as amended herein, recites a method including transmitting data representing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; analyzing the visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data

is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and storing the identified content data.

Applicant's Claim 25, as amended herein, recites a computer implemented method including: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; analyzing the visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and initiating performance of an action based on results of identifying of at least some of the content data.

Applicant's Claim 26, as amended herein, recites computer readable media containing a computer program including instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; analyzing the visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and initiating performance of an action based on results of identifying at least some of the content data.

Applicant's Claim 27, as amended herein, recites a computer system including: an input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; and a processor that analyzes the visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data and initiates performance of an action based on results of the identification of at least some of the content data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template.

Stiegemeier discloses a data management system user interface that allows users to enter, store, retrieve, and display multiple, related groups of information in a single document. The interface loads document data into a separate template which defines various fields, and the interface determines that should be displayed based on the information entered by the user. The interface also contains data validation and error correction feature that provides automatic correction, prompts for manual correction and allows the user to save a document with a list of errors for future correction at a later date. (See Abstract; Col. 1, Lines 11-17). The system retrieves a document that may optionally include a code identifying a template that provides the format for displaying the data. If the template resides in memory, or if the template is loaded into active memory, the system may access the document, extract the data from the document, format the data in accordance with the template instructions and the client script program, and display the data in the format as instructed by the template. (Col. 10, Lines 31-57; Figures 3 and 4).

Hoth relates generally to a report generation program for generating reports within a homogeneous or heterogeneous database system. (Col. 1, Lines 5-9). To generate a report, the report generator or Report Engine is executed causing a Report Definition Form to be displayed. The Report Definition Form contains the user provided database names, searchable field categories and searchable field category options, and the names of Report Templates. The user selects one of the Report Templates thereby determining the display format for the report. (Col. 3, Lines 30-49; Col. 5, Lines 43-55). Figure 4 discloses a Report Definition Form that includes a Report Format Section listing one or more Report Templates. Figure 5 discloses a Report Template. (Col. 9, Line 54-Col. 10, Line 52).

Applicant's amended Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Claim 1. Stiegemeier discloses application documents that are a compound collection of template information and subject data in which the template information is used to format the data for display. Stiegemeier discloses using the template to produce displayed data in the format as instructed by the template, rather than using the template to analyze the displayed data. In other words, Stiegemeier teaches using a template to produce a displayed format of data rather

than using a template to analyze the displayed format of data after it has been produced. Hoth discloses using a report template to format a generated report. Hoth teaches using a report template to produce the report rather than using a template of any type to analyze the report produced as an output. The references of Stiegemeier and Hoth do not disclose using a template to analyze the visual form of data produced after the format data is applied to the content data.

Applicant's amended Claim 1 recites that the visual form of data is produced by applying format data to content data. The visual form of data produced is then analyzed using a template. Applicant's Claim 1 recites analyzing an output, the visual form of data, using a template. In contrast, Stiegemeier and Hoth both disclose producing a resultant output using some form of template. In Hoth, the output is a report produced using a report template. In Stiegemeier, the output is data in a display format in accordance with template instructions. An embodiment of Applicant's claimed invention may, for example, use the resulting display of Stiegemeier as an input which is then analyzed using a template, as in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in amended Claim 1.

Applicant fails to see where in Stiegemeier there is disclosure or suggestion of ***analyzing the visual form of data using a template in which the visual form of data is produced by applying format data to content data***, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Applicant's recited visual form of data may include, for example, a display format of data. This display

format may include, for example, the resulting display formatted data produced by Stiegemeier. Stiegemeier's template is not used to analyze the display formatted data, but rather to produce the resulting display formatted data.

The Office Action cites Stiegemeier at Col. 10, Lines 50-55 as support for disclosure of Applicant's recited feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data,*** as set forth in Claim 1. Col. 10, Lines 50-55 of Stiegemeier, as discussed above, discloses extracting data from a document, formatting the data in accordance with template instructions and a client script program, and then displaying the data in the format as instructed by the template resulting in an "activated" document. Stiegemeier's "activated" document is not analyzed using the template, but rather is produced as an output using the template. Stiegemeier's template appears to be used as the format data recited in Applicant's Claim 1. Stiegemeier's template cannot function as both Applicant's recited elements of format data and template since, as recited in Claim 1, ***the content data and format data are different from the template.*** Accordingly, Stiegemeier does not appear to disclose or suggest Applicant's recited template and its use in analyzing a visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data, as set forth in amended Claim 1.

For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 17 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***computer readable media containing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in***

accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format are different from said template; and storing the identified content data, as set forth in amended Claim 17.

For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 18 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer system comprising: a input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; a processor that analyzes said visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and a storage media that stores the identified content data,*** as set forth in amended Claim 18.

For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 19 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method comprising: transmitting data representing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template after said format data is applied to said content data to***

produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data, as set forth in amended Claim 19.

For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 25 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and initiating performance of an action based on results of said identifying of at least some of the content data***, as set forth in amended Claim 25.

For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 26 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***computer readable media containing a computer program comprising instructions for: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data , wherein said content data and said format data are different***

from said template; and initiating performance of an action based on results of said identifying ~~of~~ at least some of the content data, as set forth in amended Claim 26.

For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 27 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer system comprising: an input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; and a processor that analyzes said visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data and initiates performance of an action based on results of said identification of at least some of the content data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 27.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 4-6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Hoth and in further view of Graefe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,342, hereinafter referred to as "Graefe") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4-6, and 10 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 4-6 and 10 depend from independent Claim 1. For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Stiegemeier and Hoth. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining Stiegemeier and Hoth with Graefe also neither discloses nor suggests Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Graefe relates to electronic data processing, and more specifically concerns new query operations for the manipulation of tables in relational databases and similar types of data-management software. (Col. 1, Lines 7-10). Graefe discloses a "pivot" operation that rotates data items in a relational database table so that certain data values in the table become column names of the pivoted table, and the data items of a specified value column appear in corresponding rows in the new columns of the pivoted table. (See Abstract; Col. 3, Lines 7-20).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Claim 1. For reasons set forth above, Hoth and Stiegemeier neither disclose or suggest ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to***

produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template, as set forth in Claim 1. Graefe discloses rotating items in a relational database table and appears silent on any disclosure of analyzing a visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data. Thus, Graefe does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier and Hoth with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Geaghan (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,114, hereinafter referred to as "Geaghan") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 8 depends from independent Claim 1. For reasons set forth below, Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Geaghan discloses an electronic whiteboard coupled to a computer which receives information from the whiteboard indicative of a graphical user inputs entered via a writing region of the whiteboard and control inputs entered via a control region of the whiteboard. A driver executing on the whiteboard receives the information transmitted by the whiteboard, performs certain actions on the received data, and causes an application program to retrieve the information and store the information to a session file. The application provides a user interface which allows a user to view images generated on the whiteboard, store such images, and view previously stored images. The images may also be manipulated in a variety of ways. (See Abstract; Col. 1, Line 52-Col. 2, Line 5).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Claim 1. As set forth above, Stiegemeier does not ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 1. Geaghan discloses providing a user interface allowing users to view images

and manipulate images. However, Geaghan appears silent on any disclosure about analyzing a visual form of data. Additionally, Geaghan neither discloses nor suggests using a template to analyze a visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data. Thus, Geaghan does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Graefe and Ishikawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,527, hereinafter referred to as "Ishikawa") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claim 11 is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 11 depends from Claim 1. For reasons set forth below, Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Ishikawa relates to facial image processing techniques, and more specifically, an improved facial processing method and apparatus for generating feature coordinate information corresponding to characteristic parts of a facial image useful in facial morphing, identification

and blending operations. (Col. 1, Lines 6-11). Ishikawa discloses extracting specific feature areas of a facial image and outputting accurate coordinate data for the extracted facial features. (See Abstract).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Claim 1. Ishikawa appears silent regarding analyzing a visual form of data produced when format data is applied to content data. Further, Ishikawa appears silent regarding disclosing a template used in analyzing the visual form of data. Thus, Ishikawa does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier and Graefe with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data,*** as set forth in Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of Hoth and further in view of Maejima et al. (USP 5,327,568, hereinafter referred to as "Maejima") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 12-14 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 12-14 depend from independent Claim 1. For reasons set forth above, Applicant's amended Claim 1 is patentable over Stiegemeier and Hoth. Applicant respectfully submits that, for reasons set forth below, combining Stiegemeier and Hoth with Maejima also neither discloses nor suggests Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Maejima discloses an apparatus for supporting development of a graphic data drive program including a data driven mechanism enabling instructions of the data driven program to be executed whenever all input data necessary for executing the instructions is available. (See Abstract). Maejima discloses producing and executing an instruction template and displaying the execution process of the instruction on the screen of a terminal. (Col. 5, Lines 37-42).

Applicant's Claim 1, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer implemented method comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce***

said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data, as set forth in Claim 1. For reasons set forth above, Hoth and Stiegemeier neither disclose or suggest ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in Claim 1. Maejima discloses producing and executing an instruction template and displaying the execution process of the instruction on the screen of a terminal, but appears silent on analyzing any visual form of data. Further, Maejima's template is a code template including instructions that are machine language instructions whose execution is displayed on a screen. Maejima's template is not used in analyzing any visual form of data. Thus, Maejima does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Stiegemeier and Hoth with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the features of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 50, 52-54, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 87-89, 92 and 93 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,712, hereinafter referred to as "DuFresne") in view of Hoth is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 50, 52-54, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 87-89, 92 and 93, as amended herein, are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 50, as amended herein, recites a method executed in a computer system for processing data including: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; analyzing the visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with the template having an extraction instruction after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value. Claims 52-54 depend from Claim 50.

Claim 67, as amended herein, recites a method executed in a computer system for processing data including: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing the visual form of data using the template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with the template after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, the template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of

data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in the template. Claims 68, 70, and 72-74 depend from Claim 67.

Claim 87, as amended herein, recites a system for processing data including: a data receiver that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually displayed, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; a template runner that applies a template to the visual form of the data and analyzes the visual form of data using the template and identifies a portion of the content data used in generating at least one tag value after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and a database in which the template is stored. Claims 88 and 89 depend from Claim 87.

Claim 92, as amended herein, recites a computer program product used to process data including: machine executable code that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; machine executable code that analyzes the visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with the template having an extraction instruction after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and machine executable code that stores the identified content data as at least one tag value.

Claim 93, as amended herein, recites a computer program product used to process data in a computer system including: machine executable code that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data; machine executable code that applies a template to the visual form of data; machine executable code that analyzes the visual form of data using the template and identifies a portion of the content data in accordance with the template, the template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data after the format data is applied to the content data to produce the visual form of data, wherein the content data and the format data are different from the template; and machine executable code that extracts a tag value for at least one tag identified in the template.

DuFresne discloses deploying applications based on the HTTP protocol. (See Abstract; Col. 2, Line 58-Col. 3, Line 3). Executable tags (tag extensions) are inserted in an HTML source. The extensions are processed and replaced with values such that only HTML tags remain with static values as arguments. (Col. 3, Lines 4-55). A template is an HTML form to define contents of a display Web page requested by a client. The template includes HTML tags and tag extensions to define and build a web page. (Col. 8, Lines 59-67).

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is***

applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, Hoth neither discloses nor suggests ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template.*** DuFresne discloses using a template including HTML tags embedded with text which, when processed, produces a displayed Web page. DuFresne does not analyze a visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data. DuFresne produces a display page and processes the HTML tag extensions included in a template. DuFresne discloses a template that includes HTML tags embedded with text that is displayed. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50.

DuFresne's Figure 8 shows the template/database pairs. DuFresne, at Col. 9, Lines 50-53, recites that each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The template of DuFresne is an HTML

form to define contents of a display web page and includes HTML tags and tag extensions to define and build a Web page. (Col. 8, Lines 59-67). DuFresne discloses how to produce the Web page using a template and the Web page may be subsequently displayed by a Web browser. (See Abstract; Col. 18, Lines 40-43). As set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 1, the content data is the data to be represented visually, and the format data causes the content data to be visually represented in a particular manner in the visual form which is then analyzed using a template. The displayed Web page of DuFresne, as may be produced by a browser, may be characterized as one example of Applicant's recited visual form of data which, as set forth in Applicant's Claim 1, is analyzed using Applicant's recited template. DuFresne makes no disclosure or suggestion of analyzing the displayed Web page produced by a Web browser processing the output Web page. Further, DuFresne discloses using a template to produce the output Web page, not using a template to analyze the displayed format of the Web page as it may appear, for example, on a computer display after processing by a Web browser.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the***

visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template, as set forth in amended Claim 67.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's Claim 87, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a system for processing data comprising: a data receiver that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually displayed, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; a template runner that applies a template to said visual form of the data and analyzes said visual form of data using said template and identifies a portion of the content data used in generating at least one tag value after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and a database in which said template is stored,*** as set forth in amended Claim 87.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's Claim 92, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer program product used to process data comprising: machine executable code that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; machine executable code that analyzes said visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an***

extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and machine executable code that stores the identified content data as at least one tag value, as set forth in amended Claim 92.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's Claim 93, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a computer program product used to process data in a computer system comprising: machine executable code that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; machine executable code that applies a template to the visual form of data; machine executable code that analyzes said visual form of data using said template and identifies a portion of the content data in accordance with said template, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and machine executable code that extracts a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 93.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 51, 71, 90 and 91 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Graefe and Ishikawa is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 51, 71, 90 and 91 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 51 depends from independent Claim 50. Claim 71 depends from independent Claim 67. Claims 90 and 91 depend from independent Claim 87. For reasons set forth above, Claims 50, 67 and 87 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne and Hoth. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining DuFresne and Hoth with Graefe and Ishikawa also neither disclose nor suggest Applicant's Claims 50, 67 and 87, as amended herein.

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed or suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, Du Fresne and Hoth neither disclose nor suggest ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction***

instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template, as set forth in Claim 50. As discussed elsewhere herein, Graefe discloses rotating items in a relational database table and appears silent on any disclosure of analyzing any form of visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data. As also discussed elsewhere herein, Ishikawa appears silent regarding analyzing an form of visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data. Further, Ishikawa appears silent regarding disclosing a template used in analyzing the visual form of data. Thus, Graefe and Ishikawa do not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFrense with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in amended Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest a ***method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said***

template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template, as set forth in amended Claim 67.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's Claim 87, as amended herein, is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest a ***system for processing data comprising: a data receiver that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually displayed, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; a template runner that applies a template to said visual form of the data and analyzes said visual form of data using said template and identifies a portion of the content data used in generating at least one tag value after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and a database in which said template is stored,*** as set forth in amended Claim 87.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 55-58 and 75-78 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Maejima is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 55-58 and 75-78 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 55-58 depend from independent Claim 50. Claims 75-78 depend from independent Claim 67. For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claim 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne and Hoth. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining DuFresne and Hoth with Maejima also neither discloses nor suggests independent Claims 50 and 67.

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed or suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne and Hoth neither disclose nor suggest ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 50. As discussed elsewhere herein, Maejima discloses producing and executing an instruction template and displaying the execution process of the instruction on the screen of a

terminal, but appears silent on analyzing the visual form of data. Further, Maejima's template is a code template including instructions that are machine language instructions whose execution is displayed on a screen. Maejima's template is not used in analyzing any visual form of data. Thus, Maejima does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne and Hoth with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in amended Claim 50.

For reasons set forth above regarding Claim 50, Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 59-62 and 79-82 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Graefe is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 59-62 and 79-82 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 59-62 depend from independent Claim 50. Claims 75-78 depend from independent Claim 67. For reasons set forth above, Applicant's Claims 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne and Hoth. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining DuFresne and Hoth with Graefe also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 50 and 67.

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed or suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are***

different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value, as set forth in amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne and Hoth neither disclose nor suggest ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with ~~a~~ said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 50. As discussed elsewhere herein, Graefe discloses rotating items in a relational database table and appears silent on any disclosure of analyzing any visual form of data. Thus, Graefe does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne and Hoth with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with ~~a~~ said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in amended Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth above regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after***

said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template, as set forth in amended Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 63, 64, 66, 83, 84 and 86 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Ferrel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,173, hereinafter referred to as "Ferrel") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 63, 64, 66, 83, 84 and 86 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claims 63, 64 and 66 depend from independent Claim 50. Claims 83, 84 and 86 depend from independent Claim 67. For reasons set forth above, Claims 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne and Hoth. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining DuFresne and Hoth with Ferrel also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 50 and 67.

Ferrel relates to electronic publishing systems and, more specifically, to an authoring system for creating structured documents in an on-line publishing system. (Col. 1, Lines 7-10). Ferrel's system includes a story editor that can save files in a multimedia document format. (See

Abstract; Col. 3, Lines 39-45). Ferrel discloses publishing structured documents in an electronic publication system including inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with a tag, inserting an embedded object into the story object, storing the tagged text portions in a first object storage of the story object, storing the embedded object into a second object storage of the story object, and displaying selected ones of the text portions and the embedded object, the selection dependent upon the tags. (Col. 4, Lines 9-19).

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed or suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with ~~a~~ said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne and Hoth neither disclose nor suggest ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with ~~a~~ said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 50. Ferrel appears silent regarding analyzing any visual form of data produced by

applying format data to content data. Ferrel also appears silent on using a template in analyzing the visual form of data. Thus, Ferrel does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne an Hoth with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 65 and 85 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Ferrel and Petty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,907, hereinafter referred to as "Petty") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 65 and 85 are patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 65 depend from independent Claim 50. Claim 68 depends from independent Claim 67. For reasons set forth above, Claims 50 and 67 are neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne, Hoth and Ferrel. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that combining DuFresne, Hoth and Ferrel with Petty also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 50 and 67.

Petty discloses a specification language that allows a user to define platform independent user interface panels without detailed knowledge of complex computer programming languages. The specification language is referred to as a Panel Definition Markup Language (PDML) that defines tags used similar to those in HTML. A graphical editor allows the creation and modification of platform-independent user interface panels. Petty also discloses a converter tool that may be used to convert platform-specific user interface panels to corresponding platform independent user interface panels. (See Abstract; Col. 1, Lines 12-15).

Applicant's Claim 50, as amended herein, is neither disclosed or suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value,*** as set forth in amended Claim 50. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne, Hoth, and Ferrel neither disclose nor suggest ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 50. Petty appears silent regarding any disclosure of analyzing the visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data or using a template in any such analysis. Thus, Petty does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne, Hoth, and Ferrel with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 50. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with a said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in Claim 50.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 50, Applicant's amended Claim 67 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,*** as set forth in amended Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 69 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hoth and further in view of Sparks (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,382, hereinafter referred to as "Sparks") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Claim 69 is patentable over the references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 69 depends from Claim 67. For reasons set forth elsewhere herein, Claim 67 is neither disclosed nor suggested by DuFresne and Hoth. For reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that combining DuFresne and Hoth with Sparks also neither discloses nor suggests Claim 67.

Sparks pertains generally to the field of print advertising and commercial display signage and their design and production, and more specifically to an integrated system using an Internet site and networked computer systems for the storage of pre-designed formats and images, the assembly of them into electronic files ready for production, and the ordering of all design, assembly, production, and distribution from a single entry point in the system. (Col. 1, Lines 8-16). A client at a remote site may order each of a series of images for a low resolution image database and may then assemble these images and text into a marketing piece. The client may assemble the marketing pieces according to one of a series of predefined templates. (See Abstract).

Applicant's Claim 67, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references in that the references neither disclose nor suggest ***a method executed in a computer system for processing data comprising: receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content***

data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template,, as set forth in amended Claim 67. For reasons set forth above, DuFresne and Hoth neither discloses nor suggests the feature of ***analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template***, as set forth in amended Claim 67. Sparks appears silent regarding analyzing any visual form of data produced by applying format data to content data. Further, Sparks discloses using a template to assemble a marketing piece from a series of images, but appears silent on disclosing a template used in analyzing any visual form of data. Thus, Sparks does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies of DuFresne and Hoth with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 67. Accordingly, the references neither disclose nor suggest at least the features of ***analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template,,*** as set forth in Claim 67.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that newly added Claims 94-100 are also patentable over the cited art.

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections and objections. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 617-248-4042.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART

Anne E. Saturnelli
Registration No. 41,290

Patent Group
Choate, Hall & Stewart
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-2804
Tel: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 248-4000

September 26, 2003